From:
 Waite, Andrew

 To:
 Ngo, Kim

 Cc:
 R6HarveyInfo

Subject: M6H1 – Harvey Response RE: Water

Date: Sunday, September 3, 2017 8:28:56 AM

Since R6 deployment (8/28) R6 has made 1.517 contacts

apjetrovic 185

camacho.amy 302

ctingey 220

jibarra 90

lisa.pham 158

nunez.alex 194

nyoung 179

okpala.maria 112

omartinez 77

1517

Regards

Andrew J. Waite R6 WQ-SD 214.665.7332

After a momentary silence spake

Some Vessel of a more ungainly Make;

"They sneer at me for leaning all awry:

"What! did the Hand then of the Potter shake?"



Mater: What is it Worth to You?

From: Ngo, Kim

Sent: Sunday, September 03, 2017 8:17 AM

To: Crossland, Ronnie < Crossland. Ronnie@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Water

Ronnie.

The universe in Response Manager is about 7000 systems (4514 DW + 2468 WW).

Last weekend, TCEQ requested 10 people from EPA to help with the phone bank. EPA deployed 10 people to Austin on Monday 8/28.

So far, over 5 days, EPA conducted over 1500 phone calls (DW + WW), see table below.

Assuming TCEQ phone bank staff conducted the same number of calls as EPA staff, that would make the total calls between EPA + TCEQ to be about 3000 ...

That's about 40% of the universe in RM over 5 days.

Note: some of these calls are to the <u>same</u> systems. (example: after 3 calls unreachable, we assign a "site visit needed" status).

If we assume this burn rate going forward between EPA + TCEQ, we would need about 7 more days to get to all 7000 systems.

TCEQ is planning to have a call on Monday 9/4 to reassess the phone bank needs. It has been my understanding that TCEQ Houston Regional office is opening back up next week, and when TCEQ staff return to work, they will take over their systems calls. We will know more after TCEQ reassess.

EPA callers burn rate at TCEQ Austin phone bank:

8/29/2017	139	
8/30/2017	218	
8/31/2017	221	
9/1/2017	345	
9/2/2017	586	
	1509	

From: Crossland, Ronnie

Sent: Sunday, September 03, 2017 6:34 AM

To: Ngo, Kim < Ngo.Kim@epa.gov>

 $\textbf{Cc:} \ Smalley, \ Bryant < \underline{smalley.bryant@epa.gov}; \ Smith, \ Monica < \underline{smith.monica@epa.gov}; \ Webster, \ Susan < \underline{webster.susan@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig < \underline{Carroll.Craig@epa.gov}; \ Foster, \ Susan < \underline{smith.monica@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig < \underline{smith.monica@epa.gov}; \ Foster, \ Susan < \underline{smith.monica@epa.gov}; \$

Althea < Foster. Althea@epa.gov >; Waite, Andrew < Waite. Andrew@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: Water

Kim,

Seems to me we should have attempted to contact every system after one week. By lumping not contacted and systems unreachable/did not answer is misleading. Because we can solve one with more resources and another category might require a site visit.

What can we do to differential which category we are talking about? If we just need more people to call phone numbers, we should do that. If it is that no one is home, do we have a number of attempts rule and then if no answer prioritize it for a site visit?

I hope the situation is where we have attempted to contact all of the systems and now we are on our 3rd round to try to contact with the next step something more aggressive.

Thanks, Ronnie

From: Ngo, Kim

Sent: Saturday, September 02, 2017 11:25 PM

To: Crossland, Ronnie < Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov>

 $\textbf{Cc:} \ Smalley, \ Bryant < \underline{smalley.bryant@epa.gov}; \ Smith, \ Monica < \underline{smith.monica@epa.gov}; \ Webster, \ Susan < \underline{webster.susan@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig < \underline{Carroll.Craig@epa.gov}; \ Foster, \ Craig < \underline{Carroll.Craig@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig@epa.gov < \underline{Carroll.Craig@epa.gov}; \ Carroll, \ Craig@epa.gov < \underline{Ca$

Althea < Foster. Althea @epa.gov >; Waite, Andrew < Waite. Andrew @epa.gov >

Subject: RE: Water

Ronnie,

TCEQ and EPA have "not contacted" 2337 Drinking Water (DW) and 563 Wastewater (WW) systems. This represents 51% DW and 22% WW of the systems that are loaded in RM.

"Not contacted" means: systems that TCEQ/EPA have not yet called + systems that were unreachable/did not answer.

	DW	ww
No status (not yet contacted)	2145	384
Contact attempted,		
unreachable	192	179
Total "not contacted"	2337	563
Universe of systems (in RM)	4514	2468
% systems "not contacted"	51%	22%

(Data from Response Manager 9/2/2017, 9:45 pm CT).

These numbers will fall tomorrow, as data sheets received in Austin Office late in today have not been entered into RM.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

From: Crossland, Ronnie

Sent: Saturday, September 02, 2017 8:06 PM

To: Ngo, Kim < Ngo.Kim@epa.gov >

Cc: Smalley, Bryant <<u>smalley.bryant@epa.gov</u>>; Smith, Monica <<u>smith.monica@epa.gov</u>>; Webster, Susan <<u>webster.susan@epa.gov</u>>; Carroll, Craig <<u>Carroll.Craig@epa.gov</u>>; Foster,

Althea < Foster. Althea@epa.gov >

Subject: FW: Water

Kim,

I am sure there is an answer to Sam's question. Can you please draft a response for me to Sam.

Thanks, Ronnie

From: Coleman, Sam

Sent: Saturday, September 02, 2017 7:46 PM

To: Edlund, Carl < Edlund.Carl@epa.gov >; Gray, David < gray.david@epa.gov >; Crossland, Ronnie < Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov >; Carroll, Craig < Carroll.Craig@epa.gov >; Smalley,

Bryant < smalley.bryant@epa.gov>; Smith, Monica < smith.monica@epa.gov>

Subject: Water

Periodic update.

Working on DW and WW updates. Do we have data on systems that have not been contacted.

Samuel Coleman, P. E., Deputy Regional Administrator

214.665.2100 Ofc 214.665.3110 Desk 214.665.2016 Cell

Coleman.sam@epa.gov

Sent from my iPhone